

IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE NEW JERSEY INTERIM STATE DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

REPORT III: SUPPLEMENTAL AIPLAN ASSESSMENT

REPORT III: RESEARCH FINDINGS— THE SUPPLEMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF AIPLAN

Prepared for

New Jersey
Office of State Planning (OSP)

Research Oversight:

John W. Epling, Director, OSP
Robert A. Kull, Asst. Director, OSP

Prepared By

Rutgers University
Center for Urban Policy Research (CUPR)

Principal Investigator

Robert W. Burchell, Rutgers University

Participating Investigators

Adesoji O. Adelaja, Rutgers University
Roland Anglin, Rutgers University
W. Patrick Beaton, Rutgers University
Richard K. Brail, Rutgers University
Michael N. Danielson, Princeton University
William R. Dolphin, Rutgers University
Eugene D. Driscoll, HydroQual, Inc.
Susan J. Foxley, Rutgers University
Norman J. Glickman, Rutgers University (Project Manager)
David Hamme, Wallace Roberts & Todd
Patricia M. Kehrberger, HydroQual, Inc.
Karen A. Danielsen-Lang, Rutgers University
David Listokin, Rutgers University
Nancy H. Mantell, Rutgers University
Lawrence Q. Newton, Rutgers University
Olugbenga A. Onafowora, Susquehanna University
Henry O. Pollakowski, Harvard University
Alex Schwartz, Rutgers University
Antoinette F. Seymour, Wallace Roberts & Todd
R. E. Sieber, Rutgers University
Susan M. Wachter, University of Pennsylvania
Carole C. Walker, Rutgers University
Julian Wolpert, Princeton University
Jong Keun You, Rutgers University

Date

30 April 1992

**IMPACT ASSESSMENT
RESPONSIBILITIES**

IMPACT ASSESSMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

Robert W. Burchell	Overall Research Strategy/Design TREND/IPLAN Interpretation Model Integration Coordination of Research Modeling and Case Studies Population Projection/Land Capacity Model Linkage/Feedback/Evaluation Model
David Listokin	Fiscal Impact Model Fiscal Impact Case Study Farmers' Equity Case Study School Capital Facilities Model Intergovernmental Coordination Model Water Quality Case Study
Adesoji O. Adelaja Olugbenga A. Onafowora	Agricultural Lands Model Farmers' Equity Case Study Agricultural Equity Analysis
Roland Anglin	Intergovernmental Coordination Model Intergovernmental Case Study
Richard K. Brail R. E. Sieber	Transportation Infrastructure Model CUPR Road CUPR Transit Water and Sewer Demand Model
Michael N. Danielson Julian Wolpert	Quality of Life Model Quality of Life Case Study
Carole C. Walker	Water and Sewer Demand Model Water Cost Model OSP Wastewater Cost Model

Jong Keun You
Norman J. Glickman
Nancy Mantell

Econometric Model
Economic Case Study

Alex Schwartz

Housing Demand/Supply Model
Housing and Property Development Cost Model
Transportation Case Study

Henry O. Pollakowski

Housing and Property Development Cost Model

Lawrence Q. Newton

Economic Impact Model
Fiscal Impact Model
Fiscal Impact Case Study
School Capital Facilities Model
Water Pollution Model
Air Pollution Model

Antoinette F. Seymour
David Hamme

Frail Environmental Lands Model

Patricia M. Kehrberger
Eugene D. Driscoll

Water Quality Case Study

Karen Danielsen-Lang
Arlene Pashman

Study Integration and Synthesis

Susan J. Foxley

Intergovernmental Coordination Model
Quality of Life Model

William R. Dolphin

Overall Model Building and Projection
Programming of Models
Data Acquisition and Input

W. Patrick Beaton

Property Cost Case Study

Susan M. Wachter

Advisory Committee Input

**INTRODUCTION TO THE
SUPPLEMENTAL
AIPLAN ASSESSMENT**

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Supplemental Impact Assessment is to gauge differences in impact on the State of New Jersey of the Amended Interim Plan (AIPLAN). This is to be contrasted with the impact on the State of historical or TREND conditions. The supplemental assessment differs from the assessment of the Interim Plan (IPLAN) in that this analysis contains mapping changes that have occurred over the sixty days between the two analyses (February 28 to April 30, 1992), as well as resolution of deferred issues during that period.

The primary effects on the differences observed in the IPLAN versus AIPLAN analyses reflect the mapping differences including both Planning Area designations and the number of Centers. In the first case, the most critical variable is the amount of vacant land in each of the Planning Area categories. These data were originally available using vacant land estimates from the New Jersey Department of the Treasury files, attempting to physically locate these lands in a municipality, and then applying Planning Area designations to the targeted vacant lands.

When the Resource Planning Management Map (RPMM) became available in early April 1992 and information on vacant land from LANDSAT and Planning Area designations could be simultaneously digitized, a much more accurate means of determining both the amount of vacant land and its location was at hand. Simultaneously affecting the mapped lands in Planning Area categories was a general change in land designations as a result of ongoing Cross-acceptance negotiations.

Other factors affecting differences between the IPLAN and AIPLAN analyses are the additional designation of Centers (approximately 10 percent more non-Hamlet Centers) as well as changes in the locations of Centers. There are now more Regional Centers and more Centers designated in the central and southern parts of the State than was the case in the analysis of the Interim Plan.

Two other minor non-mapping changes also are in evidence in the AIPLAN analysis that were not present earlier. The holding capacity of Villages was doubled and the physical size of Hamlets was lessened even though the latter has no effect on holding capacity. These are the main factors affecting changes in the two analyses. As will be shown in the report that follows, the differences in impact on the State of New Jersey of the Interim Plan (IPLAN) versus the Amended Interim Plan (AIPLAN) are for the most part almost nondiscernible.

The analysis that follows is a complete rerun of all Impact Assessment models using the new mapping information. Each section dealing with impacts is arranged in the following order:

Original Assessment Findings
Supplemental Assessment Findings
Comparative Impact Assessment Differences
General Questions Asked/Answers Provided
Monitoring/Evaluation Recommendations
Desirable Changes to be Incorporated into the State Plan

The first of the latter three sections summarizes both questions and answers arising at Advisory Committee meetings and/or public presentations. The second and third of the latter three sections represent the study team's opinions with regard to necessary requirements for ongoing assessment of the State Plan as well as suggested changes to allow the Plan to perform better.

The study team has undergone a considerable effort to carefully evaluate and reevaluate the State Plan and communicate this knowledge to peer groups and the general public. It has truly been a fruitful and worthwhile effort.

**SUMMARY OF THE
SUPPLEMENTAL
AIPLAN ASSESSMENT**

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Supplemental Impact Assessment of the Amended Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan (AIPLAN) finds similar impacts and relationships with traditional development (TREND) that were found for the Interim Plan (IPLAN). Overall, the same general conclusion and specific findings pertain.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Implementation of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan will be beneficial to the State of New Jersey. It will bring benefits to the State and its citizens that traditional development will not. Although the increases are relatively slight, the Amended Interim Plan (AIPLAN) is even more beneficial to the State than was the Interim Plan (IPLAN).

ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

The State Development and Redevelopment Plan will not drive people or businesses from the State of New Jersey. To the contrary, it will cause jobs and housing to be located where they are most needed in the State and where they can develop and be publicly serviced with more efficiency. As a result, it will provide an average annual operational cost savings of \$380 million to municipalities and school districts by the year 2010. Over the 1990-2010 twenty-year projection period this saving, which increases over time, amounts to \$3.8 billion cumulatively. It is of the same magnitude as was observed for the Interim Plan.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The State Plan will save 175,000 acres of land while accommodating the same level of development as would be the case for traditional development. It will further save 42,000 acres of agricultural lands and 30,000 acres of frail environmental lands.

The State Plan will have significant effects on the improvement of water quality and minor but positive effects on air quality. The Amended Interim Plan is slightly more advantageous in these areas than was the case for the Interim Plan.

INFRASTRUCTURE ASSESSMENT

The State Development and Redevelopment Plan, by encouraging more compact and more efficient development patterns, will save citizens of the State of New Jersey \$1.44 billion in infrastructure costs. This is composed of \$700 million in road costs, \$562 million in water and sewer costs, and \$178 million in school capital facilities costs. These results are almost identical to those found for the Interim Plan (IPLAN).

COMMUNITY LIFE ASSESSMENT

Housing costs (in constant dollars) in New Jersey will remain level or decrease slightly from 1990 to 2010. Housing affordability, taking into account incomes, housing prices, and mortgage interest rates, will increase. The State Plan will lower overall housing costs as the density increases in Centers more than compensate for increased development costs in the environs. AIPLAN produces somewhat lower housing costs than was evidenced for IPLAN.

Quality of life as measured by multiple indices will generally increase in the State under both the State Plan and TREND conditions. The small portion of households seeking urban residence in the future may have lower short-term qualities of life than if more suburban or rural areas are chosen as residence locations.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION ASSESSMENT

Municipalities, counties, and State agencies dealing in land-use matters witness improvements in intergovernmental coordination as a result of the State Plan process. This result did not change from IPLAN to AIPLAN.

CONCLUSION

After two assessments of the State Plan, the latter with even more complete and representative data than was used in the initial assessment, the results are similar: The State Development and Redevelopment Plan is good for New Jersey.